
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Shinji Fukui

Attorney Docket No.: OMRN P080

Application No.: 10/799,448

Examiner: M. Lee

Filed: March 12, 2004

Group: 2192

Title: DISPLAY AND EDIT DEVICE, DISPLAY
METHOD AND PROGRAM PRODUCT

Confirmation No.: 6235

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-WEB TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted electronically through EFS-WEB to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 12, 2010.

Signed: /dn/
Deborah Neill

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal.

The review is requested for the reasons stated on the attached sheets.

Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS

The only issue remaining in this case is believed to be the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Eldridge in view of Kodosky.

Applicant believes, however, that the limitations in the two wherein-clauses in claim 1, for example, are not obvious even if the cited references are considered in combination.

In simple explanatory terms, these wherein-clauses describe the characteristics of the device of this invention as displaying a structure and its circuit simultaneously and, if a function block in this circuit (definition or instance) is selected thereafter, displaying the corresponding function block in the structure with emphasis. For example, if a function block in the circuit on the right-hand side in an illustrated figure is selected, the corresponding function block in the structural diagram on the left-hand side is displayed with emphasis. This specific feature of the present invention is not disclosed in either of the cited references and hence is believed novel and patentable.

The examination of these two wherein-clauses by the examiner starts in page 7 at line 9 of the final office action dated January 21, 2010, the examiner making reference specifically to Fig. 69 and column 85, lines 1-13 of Eldridge, which provides:

FIG. 69 shows the main display for the Block Definition Editor. The user is presented with the Project Manager tree branch representing the hierarchy of block definitions. All block definitions derived from the base types show as lower branches in the tree. A grid view shows the parameters for each block. Each row is a block parameter with the columns representing the parameter attributes. The attribute values for each parameter can be modified by the user. However, some inherited parameters cannot be overridden in the derived block definition: parameter name, value type, etc. Values that are overridden are displayed differently from those defined in the local block definition or in the parent block definition. Both the tree and grid views are based on Framework supplied editor classes.

Thus, at least the portion of Eldridge specifically referenced by the examiner is not describing or even hinting at the kind of operation characterizing the present invention as summarized above.

In applicant's earlier filed argument, terms like "right-hand side" and "left-hand side" were used simply for making the explanations easier to understand. It should be clear even from the language of the pending claims that what the present invention really intends to mean is to select a

name (definition or instance) in the structural diagram and to thereby cause the corresponding name to be displayed with emphasis. This operational and functional detail is believed novel and not obvious from the cited references.

I am the attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/kn/

Keiichi Nishimura
Reg. No. 29,093

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
510-663-1100